



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,765	09/14/2006	Lisa Kadyk	05-1038-C5	3877
63572	7590	03/09/2010	EXAMINER	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT @ BERGHOFF LLP 300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3100 CHICAGO, IL 60606			CHEU, CHANGHWA J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1641	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/09/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/567,765	Applicant(s) KADYK ET AL.
	Examiner JACOB CHEU	Art Unit 1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-15 and 20-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/10/2006 and 9/10/2008.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group I, claims 1-12 and 16-19 in the reply filed on 2/11/2010 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 1-25 are pending, and claims 13-15 and 20-25 are withdrawn from further consideration.
3. Claims 1-12 and 16-19 are under examination.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1, 10, 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With respect to claim 1, it is suggested that Applicant clearly recites the full name of RAC and MELK.

With respect to claim 10, similarly, it is suggested to spell out the PMO.

With respect to claim 1, step (b), the wording needs to clarify. It is suggested that Applicant recites two step, namely a reference activity without the test agent, and a step with the test agent. "But for" may cause confusion.

Similarly, claim 16, step (c), suffers the same problem.

With respect to claim 16, step (c), it is suggested that Applicant recites “with the test agent of (b) in claim 1”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-12 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As set forth in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988), enablement requires that the specification teach those skilled in the art to make and use the invention without undue experimentation. Factors to be considered in determining, whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include 1) the nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, 7) the relative skill of those in the art, and 8) the breadth of the claims.

The current invention directs methods for utilizing RAC modifier genes and polypeptides to identify MELK-modulating agents that are candidate therapeutic agents that can be used in the treatment of disorders associated with defective or impaired RAC function and/or MELK function.

However, in view of the specification and coupling with the art search, Examiner could not find concrete scientific evidence that MELK is involved in the RAC pathway.

The clinical data provided by Applicants are illustrated in Example VI (Expression analysis). The results are summarized in Table 1. The samples and test criteria are as followings:

For each expression analysis, tumor tissue samples were compared with matched normal tissues from the same patient. A gene was considered overexpressed in a tumor when the level of expression of the gene was 2 fold or higher in the tumor compared with its matched normal sample. In cases where normal tissue was not available, a universal pool of cDNA samples was used instead. In these cases, a gene was considered overexpressed in a tumor sample when the difference of expression levels between a tumor sample and the average of all normal samples from the same tissue type was greater than 2 times the standard deviation of all normal samples (i.e., Tumor-average (all normal samples)>2.times.STDEV (all normal samples)).

Based upon the disclosure, it can only concluded that the tumor tissues samples have elevated level of MELK expression (See Table 1). However, Applicants have not shown any data linked the MELK with RAC pathway. Taken together, the instant disclosure "assumes" the MELK plays a role in RAC pathway and thus any agent(s) capable of modulating the MELK can be potentially called RAC modulator. Thus, it would inevitably require further investigation to verify whether MELK indeed involves in the RAC pathway. *Note, if the theory of MELK involving RAC pathway has been established, it would have been an obvious step for one ordinary skill in the art to identify modulator(s) of RAC since it is well-known RAC plays essential role for cellular signaling for cancer development.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claims 1-12 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The purpose of the written description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of the filing date of the application relied on, of the specific subject matter later claimed by the inventor. *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The inventor can demonstrate possession by such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that fully set forth the claimed invention.

An inventor needs to show that the inventor was "in possession" of the invention by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1571-72 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Requiring possession of the invention, and not that which makes it obvious, ensures that the claimed invention does not overreach the scope of the inventor's contribution to the field as described in

the patent specification. *Reiffen v. Microsoft Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1342, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Depending on the facts of the case, description of a chemical genus can require something more than the description of a single species but less than all species encompassed by the claimed genus. Cf., *Regent of the Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1997). As held in *Brenner v. Manson*, " [a] patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion." See 383 U.S. 519, 536 (1966).

As has been discussed above, Applicants have not shown sufficient evidence that MELK indeed involves in RAC pathway. Thus, it is clear from the current disclosure that Applicant have failed to convey the information to one artisan in the field that Applicants are entitled to possess the asserted method.

8. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JACOB CHEU whose telephone number is (571)272-0814. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya can be reached on 571-272-0806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jacob Cheu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641